arXiv:1704.00810v1 [math.AG] 3 Apr 2017

MODULI OF STABLE SHEAVES ON A QUADRIC SURFACE SUPPORTED ON CURVES OF GENUS THREE

MARIO MAICAN

Abstract. We study the moduli space of stable sheaves of Euler characteristic 1 supported on curves of arithmetic genus 3 contained in a smooth quadric surface. We show that this moduli space is rational. We compute its Betti numbers by studying the variation of the moduli spaces of α-semi-stable pairs. We classify the stable sheaves using locally free resolutions or extensions.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{P}^1$ be the projective line over $\mathbb{C}$ and consider the surface $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with fixed polarization $\mathcal{O}(1,1) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(1)$. For a coherent algebraic sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with support of dimension 1, the Euler characteristic $\chi(\mathcal{F}(m,n))$ is a polynomial expression in m, n, of the form

$$P_{\mathcal{F}}(m,n) = rm + sn + t,$$

where r, s, t are integers depending only on $\mathcal{F}$. This is the *Hilbert polynomial* of $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\mathrm{M}(P)$ be the coarse moduli space of sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ that are semi-stable with respect to the fixed polarization and that have Hilbert polynomial P. According to [8], $\mathrm{M}(P)$ is projective, irreducible, smooth at points given by stable sheaves, and it has dimension $2rs + 1$. The spaces $\mathrm{M}(2m + 2n + 1)$ and $\mathrm{M}(2m + 2n + 2)$ were studied in [1]; the space $\mathrm{M}(3m + 2n + 1)$ was studied in [4] and [10]. We refer to the introductory section of [10] for more background information.

This paper is concerned with the study of $\mathbf{M} = \mathrm{M}(4m + 2n + 1)$. The points of $\mathbf{M}$ are stable sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ supported on curves of bidegree $(2, 4)$ and satisfying the condition $\chi(\mathcal{F}) = 1$. As already mentioned, $\mathbf{M}$ is a smooth irreducible projective variety of dimension 17. For any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, twisting by $\mathcal{O}(1,1)$ gives an isomorphism $\mathbf{M} \simeq \mathrm{M}(4m + 2n + 6t + 1)$. In the following theorem, which we prove in Section 2, we classify the sheaves in $\mathbf{M}$.

Theorem 1.1. *The variety $\mathbf{M}$ can be decomposed into an open subset $\mathbf{M}_0$, two closed irreducible subsets $\mathbf{M}_2$, $\mathbf{M}_2'$ of codimension 2, a closed irreducible subset $\mathbf{M}_4$ of codimension 4, and two locally closed irreducible subsets $\mathbf{M}_4'$, $\mathbf{M}_4''$ of codimension 4. These subsets are defined as follows: $\mathbf{M}_0$ is the set of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ having a resolution of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where φ_{12} and φ_{22} are linearly independent and the maximal minors of

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{11} & \varphi_{12} & \varphi_{13} \\ \varphi_{21} & \varphi_{22} & \varphi_{23} \end{bmatrix}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14D20, 14D22.
Key words and phrases. Moduli of sheaves, Semi-stable sheaves.

have no common factor; $\mathbf{M}_2$ *is the set of sheaves* $\mathcal{F}$ *having a resolution of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0,$$

with $\varphi_{11} \neq 0$, $\varphi_{12} \neq 0$; $\mathbf{M}_2'$ *is the set of sheaves* $\mathcal{F}$ *having a resolution of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-4) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0,$$

with $\varphi_{11} \neq 0$, $\varphi_{12} \neq 0$; $\mathbf{M}_4$ *is the set of non-split extension sheaves of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L(-1,0) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ *is a quintic curve of bidegree* $(2,3)$ *and* $L \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ *is a line of bidegree* $(0,1)$; $\mathbf{M}_4'$ *is the set of extensions of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L(1,0) \longrightarrow 0$$

satisfying the condition $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$; $\mathbf{M}_4''$ *is the set of extensions of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ *is an extension of* $\mathbb{C}_p$ *by* $\mathcal{O}_Q$ *for a point* $p \in Q \cap L$, *and satisfying the condition* $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$.

Moreover, $\mathbf{M}_2$ *and* $\mathbf{M}_4$ *are the Brill-Noether loci of sheaves satisfying the condition* $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^3$, *respectively,* $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$.

For a projective variety X we define the Poincaré polynomial

$$\mathrm{P}(X)(\xi) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathrm{H}^i(X, \mathbb{Q}) \xi^{i/2}.$$

The varieties which will appear in this paper will have no odd homology, so the above will be a genuine polynomial expression.

Theorem 1.2. *The Poincaré polynomial of* $\mathbf{M}$ *is*

$$\xi^{17} + 3\xi^{16} + 8\xi^{15} + 16\xi^{14} + 21\xi^{13} + 23\xi^{12} + 24\xi^{11} + 24\xi^{10} + 24\xi^9 + 24\xi^8 + 24\xi^7 + 24\xi^6 + 23\xi^5 + 21\xi^4 + 16\xi^3 + 8\xi^2 + 3\xi + 1.$$

The proof of this theorem rests on the wall-crossing method of Choi and Chung [3]. In Sections 3, respectively, 4, we investigate how the moduli spaces $\mathrm{M}^{\alpha}(4m+2n+1)$ and $\mathrm{M}^{\alpha}(4m+2n-1)$ of α-semi-stable pairs with Hilbert polynomial $4m+2n+1$, respectively, $4m+2n-1$ change as the parameter α goes from ∞ to $0+$.

2. Classification of sheaves

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a coherent sheaf on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. According to [2, Lemma 1], we have a spectral sequence converging to $\mathcal{F}$, whose first level E_1 has display diagram

$$\mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{F}(-1,-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) = E_1^{-2,2} \longrightarrow E_1^{-1,2} \longrightarrow E_1^{0,2} = \mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{O} \tag{1}$$

$$\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{F}(-1,-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) = E_1^{-2,1} \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} E_1^{-1,1} \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} E_1^{0,1} = \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{O}$$

$$\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(-1,-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) = E_1^{-2,0} \xrightarrow{\varphi_3} E_1^{-1,0} \xrightarrow{\varphi_4} E_1^{0,0} = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \otimes \mathcal{O}$$

All the other E_1^{ij} are zero. The sheaves $E_1^{-1,j}$ are given by the exact sequences

$$\mathrm{H}^j(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \longrightarrow E_1^{-1,j} \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^j(\mathcal{F}(-1,0)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(-1,0). \tag{2}$$

If $\mathcal{F}$ has support of dimension 1, then the first row of (1) vanishes and the convergence of the spectral sequence forces φ_2 to be surjective and yields an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \xrightarrow{\varphi_5} \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_4) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)/\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{3}$$

Proposition 2.1. *The sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathbf{M}$ satisfying $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) \neq 0$ are precisely the non-split extension sheaves of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L(-1,0) \longrightarrow 0, \tag{4}$$

where $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a quintic curve of bidegree $(2,3)$ and $L \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a line of bidegree $(0,1)$, or the non-split extension sheaves of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p \longrightarrow 0, \tag{5}$$

where $C \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a curve of bidegree $(2,4)$ and p is a point on C. Moreover, the sheaves from (5) are precisely the sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ having a resolution of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{6}$$

with $\varphi_{11} \neq 0$, $\varphi_{12} \neq 0$. Let $\mathbf{M}_4 \subset \mathbf{M}$ be the subset of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ from (4). Then $\mathbf{M}_4$ is closed, irreducible, of codimension 4, and is isomorphic to a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^{11} \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Let $\mathbf{M}_2 \subset \mathbf{M}$ be the subset of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ from (5). Then $\mathbf{M}_2$ is closed, irreducible, of codimension 2, and is isomorphic to the universal curve of bidegree $(2,4)$ in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ give a point in $\mathbf{M}$ and satisfy $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) \neq 0$. As in the proof of [10, Proposition 3.3], there is an injective morphism $\mathcal{O}_D \to \mathcal{F}(0,-1)$ for a curve D of bidegree (s,r), $s \leq 2$, $r \leq 4$. From the stability of $\mathcal{F}$ we have the inequality

$$\mathrm{p}(\mathcal{O}_D) = 1 - \frac{rs}{r+s} < -\frac{1}{6} = \mathrm{p}(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)),$$

which has solutions $(s,r) = (2,3)$ or $(2,4)$. In the first case the quotient sheaf $\mathcal{F}(0,-1)/\mathcal{O}_D$ has Hilbert polynomial m and, by the semi-stability of $\mathcal{F}$, it has no zero-dimensional torsion. Thus, $\mathcal{F}(0,-1)/\mathcal{O}_D \simeq \mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)$ for a line L of bidegree $(0,1)$. We obtain extension (4). Conversely, given extension (4), we know that $\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)$ is stable, and from [10, Proposition 3.2] we know that $\mathcal{O}_Q(0,1)$ is stable, hence it is easy to estimate the slope of a subsheaf of $\mathcal{F}$ and to deduce that $\mathcal{F}$ is stable.

Assume now that $(s,r) = (2,4)$. We obtain extension (5). Combining the standard resolution of $\mathcal{O}_C(0,1)$ with the resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p \longrightarrow 0$$

we obtain the resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0.$$

As in the proof of [9, Proposition 2.3.2], the map $\mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \to \mathcal{O}(-2,-3)$ is non-zero, hence we obtain resolution (6). Conversely, if $\mathcal{F}$ is given by a resolution as in (6), then obviously $\mathcal{F}$ is an extension as in (5). It remains to show that such a sheaf

is semi-stable. Let $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a stable subsheaf that does not contain $\mathcal{O}_C(0,1)$. By [10, Proposition 3.2], $\mathcal{O}_C(0,1)$ is stable, hence $\mathrm{p}(\mathcal{E} \cap \mathcal{O}_C(0,1)) < \mathrm{p}(\mathcal{O}_C(0,1)) = 0$, and hence $\mathrm{p}(\mathcal{E}) < \mathrm{p}(\mathcal{F})$.

By Serre duality

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q(0,1)) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q(0,1), \mathcal{O}_L(-3,-2))^* \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-3,0))^*.$$

From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow 0$$

we get the long exact sequence

$$0 = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,3)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-3,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-3,0)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,3)) = 0$$

Thus $\mathbf{M}_4$ is isomorphic to a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^{11} \times \mathbb{P}^1$. By Serre duality

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathbb{C}_p, \mathcal{O}_C(0,1)) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_C(0,1), \mathbb{C}_p)^* \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_C, \mathbb{C}_p)^*.$$

From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-4) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \longrightarrow 0$$

we get the long exact sequence

$$\mathrm{H}^0(\mathbb{C}_p) \xrightarrow{0} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathbb{C}_p) \simeq \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_C, \mathbb{C}_p) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathbb{C}_p) = 0.$$

Thus $\mathbf{M}_2$ is isomorphic to the universal curve of bidegree $(2,4)$ in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. □

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that the sheaf $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbf{M}$ satisfies $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) = 0$. Then $\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{F}) = 0$.*

Proof. Denote $d = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{F})$. According to [10, Proposition 3.3(i)], we have $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(-1,0)) = 0$. From the exact sequence (2) with $j = 0$, we have $E_1^{-1,0} = 0$. The exact sequence (3) now takes the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \xrightarrow{\varphi_5} (d+1)\mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)/\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Also by [10, Proposition 3.3(i)], $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(-1,-1)) = 0$, hence $\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{F}(-1,-1)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^5$. We can compute the Hilbert polynomial of $E_1^{-1,1}$ as in the proof of [10, Proposition 3.6] and we obtain

$$P_{E_1^{-1,1}} = P_{\mathcal{F}} - P_{\mathcal{O}} + 5P_{\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)} = 4mn + 3n + n = P_{\mathcal{O}(0,-1)} + P_{3\mathcal{O}(-1,0)}.$$

It follows that the exact sequence (2), with $j = 1$, which takes the form

$$\mathcal{O}(0,-1) \longrightarrow E_1^{-1,1} \longrightarrow 3\mathcal{O}(-1,0),$$

is also exact on the left and on the right. Thus, $E_1^{-1,1} \simeq \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus 3\mathcal{O}(-1,0)$. There is no surjective morphism

$$\varphi_2 \colon \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus 3\mathcal{O}(-1,0) \longrightarrow d\mathcal{O}$$

for $d \geq 4$, hence $d \leq 3$. Assume that $d = 3$. The maximal minors for a matrix representation of φ_2 have no common factor, otherwise φ_2 would not be surjective. Thus, $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-3,-1)$, hence $\varphi_1 = 0$, and hence we get a surjective morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{O}(-3,-1)$, which is absurd. Thus, the case when $d = 3$ is unfeasible. Assume that $d = 2$. If φ_2 is represented by a matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \star & \star & \star \\ 0 & \star & \star & \star \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2) \simeq \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-3,0)$, hence $\mathcal{O}(-3,0)$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)/\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1)$, and hence we get a surjective morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{O}(-3,0)$, which is absurd. If φ_2 is represented by a matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \star & \star & \star & 0 \\ \star & \star & \star & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-2,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,0)$, hence $\mathcal{O}(-2,-1)$ is a direct summand of $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)/\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1)$, and hence we get a surjective morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{O}(-2,-1)$, which is absurd. If

$$\varphi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \otimes u & v \otimes 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x \otimes 1 & y \otimes 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-2,0)$ and we get a surjective morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{O}(-2,0)$, which is absurd. Thus, we may write

$$\varphi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \otimes z & x \otimes 1 & y \otimes 1 & 0 \\ \star & \star & \star & v \otimes 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that the morphism $\varphi_1 \colon 5\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \to \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus 3\mathcal{O}(-1,0)$ is represented by a matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} x \otimes 1 & y \otimes 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 \otimes z & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \otimes z & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \star & \star & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

hence $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq 3\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)$, and hence $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ has Hilbert polynomial $3m + 3n + 3$. But then $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ is a destabilizing subsheaf of $\mathcal{F}$. Thus, the case when $d = 2$ is unfeasible. Assume now that $d = 1$. If

$$\varphi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x \otimes 1 & y \otimes 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

then $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2) \simeq \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-2,0) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,0)$ and we obtain a surjective morphism $\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{O}(-2,0)$, which is absurd. Thus, we may write

$$\varphi_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \otimes z & x \otimes 1 & y \otimes 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If φ_1 is represented by a matrix with two zero columns, then $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq 2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)$, hence $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ has Hilbert polynomial $2m + 2n + 2$, and hence $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ is a destabilizing subsheaf of $\mathcal{F}$. It follows that

$$\varphi_1 \sim \begin{bmatrix} x \otimes 1 & y \otimes 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 \otimes z & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \otimes z & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \otimes z & 1 \otimes w & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

hence $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-1)$, and hence $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ has Hilbert polynomial $3m + 2n + 2$. But then $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ is a destabilizing subsheaf of $\mathcal{F}$. We deduce that the case when $d = 1$ is also unfeasible. In conclusion, $d = 0$. □

Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is as in Proposition 2.2. Then the exact sequence (3) takes the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \xrightarrow{\varphi_5} \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0, \tag{7}$$

where

$$\varphi_1 \colon 5\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus 3\mathcal{O}(-1,0).$$

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ gives a point in $\mathbf{M}$ and that $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1))=0$. Assume that the maximal minors of φ_1 have a common factor. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is an extension of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L(1,0) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{8}$$

for a quintic curve $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of bidegree $(2,3)$ and a line $L \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of bidegree $(0,1)$, or is an extension of the form

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_L \longrightarrow 0, \tag{9}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is an extension of $\mathbb{C}_p$ by $\mathcal{O}_Q$ for a point $p \in Q \cap L$.

Conversely, any extension $\mathcal{F}$ as in (8) or (9) satisfying the condition $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$ is semi-stable. Let $\mathbf{M}_4' \subset \mathbf{M}$ be the subset of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ as in (8) satisfying the condition $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathbf{M}_4'' \subset \mathbf{M}$ be the subset of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ as in (9) satisfying the condition $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$. Then $\mathbf{M}_4'$ and $\mathbf{M}_4''$ are locally closed, irreducible, of codimension 4.

Proof. Let g be the greatest common divisor of the maximal minors of a matrix representing φ_1. It is known that $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}(i,j)$, where $(i+2, j+4) = \deg(g)$. The possibilities for the kernel of φ_1 are given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Kernel of φ_1.

$\deg(g)$	(i,j)	$P_{\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)}$
$(0,1)$	$(-2,-3)$	$3m+2n-1$
$(1,0)$	$(-1,-4)$	$4m+n+1$
$(0,2)$	$(-2,-2)$	$2m+2n$
$(1,1)$	$(-1,-3)$	$3m+n+1$
$(0,3)$	$(-2,-1)$	$m+2n+1$
$(1,2)$	$(-1,-2)$	$2m+n+1$
$(1,3)$	$(-1,-1)$	$m+n+1$

Note that $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_5)$ does not destabilize $\mathcal{F}$ only if $(i,j)=(-2,-3)$ or $(-2,-2)$. If $(i,j)=(-2,-2)$, then $P_{\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1)} = 2m+1$ and $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1)$ is semi-stable, which follows from the semi-stability of $\mathcal{F}$. But, according to [1, Proposition 10], $\mathrm{M}(2m+1)=\emptyset$. This contradiction shows that $(i,j) \neq (-2,-2)$, hence $(i,j)=(-2,-3)$. From (7) we obtain the extension

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

If $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1)$ has no zero-dimensional torsion, we obtain extension (8). Otherwise, the zero-dimensional torsion has length 1, its pull-back in $\mathcal{F}$ is a semi-stable sheaf $\mathcal{E}$, and we obtain extension (9).

Conversely, let $\mathcal{F}$ be an extension as in (8) satisfying $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$. Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ had a destabilizing subsheaf $\mathcal{F}'$. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the image of $\mathcal{F}'$ in $\mathcal{O}_L(1,0)$. According to [10, Proposition 3.2], $\mathcal{O}_Q$ is stable, hence $\chi(\mathcal{F}' \cap \mathcal{O}_Q) \leq -1$. Since $\chi(\mathcal{F}') \geq 1$, we see that $\chi(\mathcal{G}) \geq 2$, hence $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)$ and $\mathcal{O}_Q \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}'$. Thus $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}' \cap \mathcal{O}_Q) = 0$, hence the map $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}') \to \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0))$ is injective. But this map factors through $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0))$, which, by hypothesis, is the zero map. We deduce that $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}')=0$, which yields a contradiction. Thus, there is no destabilizing subsheaf. The same argument applies for extensions (9) satisfying $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$.

By Serre duality

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0),\mathcal{O}_Q) \simeq \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q,\mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2))^* \simeq \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q,\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))^*.$$

From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow 0$$

we get the long exact sequence

$$0 = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,3)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q,\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)) = 0.$$

Thus $\mathbf{M}_4'$ is isomorphic to an open subset of a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^{11} \times \mathbb{P}^1$. By Serre duality we have

$$\operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L,\mathcal{E}) \simeq \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2))^*.$$

It is easy to see that we have a resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0.$$

From this we obtain the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2)) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-1,1)) \simeq \mathbb{C} \\ &\longrightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2)) \longrightarrow \\ &\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2)) \simeq \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-1,1)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L,\mathcal{E}) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$, hence $\mathbf{M}_4''$ has dimension 13. The other claims about $\mathbf{M}_4''$ are obvious. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be a curve of bidegree $(2,4)$ and let $Z \subset C$ be a zero-dimensional subscheme of length 3. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$ without zero-dimensional torsion. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is uniquely determined up to isomorphism, meaning that if $\mathcal{F}'$ is another extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$ without zero-dimensional torsion, then $\mathcal{F}' \simeq \mathcal{F}$.*

Lemma 2.5. *Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ gives a point in $\mathbf{M}$ and that $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) = 0$. Assume that the maximal minors of φ_1 have no common factor. Then $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$ and $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_Z$ for a zero-dimensional subscheme $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of length 3 that is not contained in a line of bidegree $(0,1)$. Thus, from (7) we have an extension*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow 0, \tag{10}$$

that has no zero-dimensional torsion, where C is a curve of bidegree $(2,4)$ containing Z.

Proof. This lemma is analogous to [10, Lemma 4.1]. We only show that Z is not contained in a line L of bidegree $(0,1)$. Assume that the contrary holds. Choose $\varphi_{11} \in \mathbb{C} \otimes V_2^*$ defining L. Choose $\varphi_{12} \in \mathrm{S}^3 V_1^* \otimes \mathbb{C}$ such that φ_{11} and φ_{12} define Z. If $L \nsubseteq C$, then $L.C = 2$, which contradicts the fact that $Z \subset L \cap C$. Thus $L \subset C$, so there is $\varphi_{22} \in \mathrm{S}^2 V_1^* \otimes \mathrm{S}^3 V_2^*$ such that $\varphi_{11}\varphi_{22}$ is a defining polynomial of C. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(1,-4) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}' \longrightarrow 0,$$

$$\varphi = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{11} & \varphi_{12} \\ 0 & \varphi_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\mathcal{F}'$ is an extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$ without zero-dimensional torsion. By Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{F}'$, hence $1 = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}') \geq 3$. This is absurd. □

Lemma 2.6. *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be a zero-dimensional subscheme of length 3 that is not contained in a line of bidegree $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$. Then the ideal of Z has resolution*

$$0 \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \xrightarrow{\zeta^{\mathrm{T}}} \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-2,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the maximal minors of ζ have no common factor. The structure sheaf of Z has resolution

(11)

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}(-2,-4) \to \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \xrightarrow{\zeta} 2\mathcal{O}(0,-2) \to \mathcal{O}_Z \to 0.$$

Proof. We apply the spectral sequence (1) to the sheaf $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{I}_Z(1,1)$. By hypothesis $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,0)) = 0$ and $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{I}_Z(0,1)) = 0$ hence, from sequence (2) with $j = 0$, we get $E_1^{-1,0} = 0$. Since $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{I}_Z) = 0$, we have $E_1^{-2,0} = 0$. By Serre duality

$$\mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,1)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,1), \omega)^* = 0, \qquad \mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{I}_Z) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z, \omega)^* = 0.$$

To see that the group on the right vanishes apply the long $\mathrm{Ext}(-,\omega)$-sequence to the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow 0.$$

We get the exact sequence

$$0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, \omega) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z, \omega) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Z, \omega) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\omega, \mathcal{O}_Z)^* \simeq \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Z)^* = 0.$$

Thus, $E_1^{0,2} = 0$ and $E_1^{-2,2} = 0$. Analogously, from Serre duality we have

$$\mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,0)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,0), \omega)^* = 0, \qquad \mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{I}_Z(0,1)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{I}_Z(0,1), \omega)^* = 0,$$

hence, from sequence (2) with $j = 2$ we get $E_1^{-1,2} = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{I}_Z) &= -\chi(\mathcal{I}_Z) = 2, \\ \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,0)) &= -\chi(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,0)) = 1, \\ \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{I}_Z(0,1)) &= -\chi(\mathcal{I}_Z(0,1)) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $d = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{I}_Z(1,1))$. Display diagram (1) now takes the simplified form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & & & \\ 2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & E_1^{-1,1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & d\mathcal{O} \\ & & & & \\ 0 & & 0 & & (d+1)\mathcal{O} \end{array}$$

and exact sequence (2) with $j = 1$ becomes

$$\mathcal{O}(0,-1) \longrightarrow E_1^{-1,1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,0).$$

From the convergence of the spectral sequence we see that φ_2 is surjective and that we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow (d+1)\mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z(1,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)/\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

The Hilbert polynomial of $E_1^{-1,1}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} P_{E_1^{-1,1}} &= P_{\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)} + P_{d\mathcal{O}} \\ &= P_{\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1)} + P_{\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_2)/\mathcal{I}m(\varphi_1)} + P_{d\mathcal{O}} \\ &= P_{2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)} - P_{\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1)} + P_{\mathcal{I}_Z(1,1)} - P_{(d+1)\mathcal{O}} + P_{\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1)} + P_{d\mathcal{O}} \\ &= P_{2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)} - P_{\mathcal{O}} + P_{\mathcal{I}_Z(1,1)} \\ &= P_{2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)} - P_{\mathcal{O}} + P_{\mathcal{O}(1,1)} - P_{\mathcal{O}_Z} \\ &= 2mn + m + n \\ &= P_{\mathcal{O}(0,-1)} + P_{\mathcal{O}(-1,0)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $E_1^{-1,1} \simeq \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,0)$. There is no surjective morphism $\varphi_2 \colon \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,0) \to d\mathcal{O}$ for $d \geq 1$, hence $d = 0$. Thus, $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1)$ is a subsheaf of $\mathcal{O}$, hence $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) = 0$. Indeed, if $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1)$ were non-zero, then $\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1)$ would be a torsion subsheaf of $\mathcal{I}_Z(1,1)$. From the exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z(1,1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1) \longrightarrow 0$$

we get the resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow 2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(0,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,0) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_Z(1,1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

As in the proof of [10, Lemma 4.1], applying the long $\mathcal{E}xt(-, \mathcal{O}(-1,-3))$-sequence we obtain resolution (11). □

According to [1, Proposition 10], a sheaf $\mathcal{G}$ giving a point in $\mathrm{M}(rm)$ has resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow r\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \longrightarrow r\mathcal{O}(-1,0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{12}$$

According to [1, Proposition 11], a sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ giving a point in $\mathrm{M}(rm+n+1)$ has resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{13}$$

A sheaf $\mathcal{E}$ giving a point in $\mathrm{M}(m+sn+1)$ has resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-s,-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{14}$$

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\mathbf{M}_0 \subset \mathbf{M}$ be the subset of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ for which $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) = 0$, $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$ and $\operatorname{supp}(\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1))$ is not contained in a line of bidegree $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$. Then $\mathbf{M}_0$ is open and can be described as the subset of sheaves $\mathcal{F}$ having a resolution of the form*

(15)

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where φ_{12} and φ_{22} are linearly independent and the maximal minors of

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varphi_{11} & \varphi_{12} & \varphi_{13} \\ \varphi_{21} & \varphi_{22} & \varphi_{23} \end{bmatrix}$$

have no common factor.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ give a point in $\mathbf{M}_0$. Let $\mathcal{O}_Z \simeq \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1)$ and C be as in Lemma 2.5. By hypothesis Z is not contained in a line of bidegree $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$, hence $\mathcal{O}_Z \simeq \mathcal{C}oker(\zeta)$ as in (11). Let ζ_1, ζ_2, ζ_3 be the maximal minors of ζ. They are the

defining polynomials of Z, hence we can find $\varphi_{31} \in V_1^* \otimes \mathrm{S}^3 V_2^*$, $\varphi_{32} \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{S}^3 V_2^*$, $\varphi_{33} \in V_1^* \otimes \mathrm{S}^2 V_2^*$ such that $\zeta_1\varphi_{31} - \zeta_2\varphi_{32} + \zeta_3\varphi_{33}$ is the equation defining C. Let

$$\varphi = \begin{bmatrix} & \zeta & \\ \varphi_{31} & \varphi_{32} & \varphi_{33} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi)$ is an extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$ without zero-dimensional torsion and, by Lemma 2.5, the same is true of $\mathcal{F}$. From Lemma 2.4 we deduce that $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi)$. By Proposition 2.2, $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$, hence the map $\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}(0,-3)) \to \mathrm{H}^1(2\mathcal{O}(0,-2))$ is injective, which is equivalent to saying that φ_{12} and φ_{22} are linearly independent. In conclusion, $\mathcal{F}$ has resolution (15).

Conversely, assume that $\mathcal{F}$ has resolution (15). Then $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$ because φ_{12} and φ_{22} are linearly independent. We will show that $\mathcal{F}$ is semi-stable. Assume that $\mathcal{F}$ had a destabilizing subsheaf $\mathcal{E}$, which is itself semi-stable. Then $\chi(\mathcal{E}) > 0$ and $\chi(\mathcal{E}) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) = 1$, hence $\chi(\mathcal{E}) = 1$. According to [1, Proposition 10], $P_{\mathcal{E}} \neq 2n+1$, $2m+1$, $3m+1$, $4m+1$. If $P_{\mathcal{E}} = n+1$, then resolution (13) with $r = 0$ fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,0) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & 2\mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Since $\alpha \neq 0$, α is injective, hence β is injective, too, which is absurd. If $P_{\mathcal{E}} = m+1$, $m+n+1$, $m+2n+1$, we get similar diagrams in which the first row is resolution (14) with $s = 0$, 1, 2. We obtain contradictions in a similar manner. If $P_{\mathcal{E}} = 2m+n+1$ then resolution (13) with $r = 2$ is the first line of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & 2\mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

with α and β injective. But then β must factor through the kernel of the corestriction

$$\mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \xrightarrow{\zeta} 2\mathcal{O}(0,-2)$$

which is $\mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$. This is absurd. If $P_{\mathcal{E}} = 3m+n+1$, $4m+n+1$ we get similar diagrams in which the first row is resolution (13) with $r = 3$, 4. We obtain contradictions in a similar manner. Assume now that $P_{\mathcal{E}} = 2m+2n+1$ and put $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}$. Then $P_{\mathcal{G}} = 2m$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is semi-stable. Indeed, if $\mathcal{G}$ had a subsheaf $\mathcal{G}'$ with $P_{\mathcal{G}'} = a$ or $m+a$, for a constant $a > 0$, then the pull-back $\mathcal{F}'$ of $\mathcal{G}'$ in $\mathcal{F}$ would satisfy $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}') \geq 2$, which is absurd. Resolution (12) with $r = 2$ is part of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(0,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) & \longrightarrow & 2\mathcal{O}(0,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & 2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) & \longrightarrow & 2\mathcal{O}(-1,0) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

But $\alpha = 0$, which yields a contradiction. Finally, if $P_{\mathcal{E}} = 3m + 2n + 1$, we consider the semi-stable sheaf $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}$ and we get a similar diagram in which the second row is resolution (12) with $r = 1$. We obtain a contradiction in a similar manner.

Thus far we have shown that $\mathcal{F}$ gives a point in $\mathbf{M}$. Since φ_{12} and φ_{22} are linearly independent, we have $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}(0,-1)) = 0$. Note that $\mathcal{F}$ is an extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$, where Z is a zero-dimensional scheme of length 3 given by the maximal minors of ζ and C is a curve of bidegree $(2,4)$. Thus, $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F})$ generates $\mathcal{O}_C$, hence $\mathcal{K}er(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$ and $\mathcal{C}oker(\varphi_1) \simeq \mathcal{O}_Z$. Note that Z is not contained in a line of bidegree $(1,0)$ or $(0,1)$. In conclusion, $\mathcal{F}$ gives a point in $\mathbf{M}_0$. □

Proposition 2.8. *The variety* $\mathbf{M}$ *is rational.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, Lemma 2.5 and Proposition 2.7, $\mathbf{M}_0$ is a $\mathbb{P}^{11}$-bundle over an open subset of $\mathrm{Hilb}_{\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1}(3)$, so it is rational. □

Proposition 2.9. *Let* $\mathcal{F}$ *be an extension as in (10) without zero-dimensional torsion, for a curve* C *of bidegree* $(2,4)$ *and a subscheme* $Z \subset C$ *that is the intersection of two curves of bidegree* $(1,0)$*, respectively,* $(0,3)$*. Then* $\mathcal{F}$ *gives a point in* $\mathbf{M}$*. Let* $\mathbf{M}_2' \subset \mathbf{M}$ *be the subset of such sheaves* $\mathcal{F}$*. Then* $\mathbf{M}_2'$ *is closed, irreducible, of codimension* 2*, and can be described as the set of sheaves* $\mathcal{F}$ *having a resolution of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-4) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{16}$$

with $\varphi_{11} \neq 0$*,* $\varphi_{12} \neq 0$*.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$ without zero-dimensional torsion. Let $\varphi_{11} \in V_1^* \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and $\varphi_{12} \in \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathrm{S}^3 V_2^*$ be the defining polynomials of Z. We can find $\varphi_{21} \in \mathrm{S}^2 V_1^* \otimes V_2^*$ and $\varphi_{22} \in V_1^* \otimes \mathrm{S}^4 V_2^*$ such that $\varphi_{11}\varphi_{22} - \varphi_{12}\varphi_{21}$ is the defining polynomial of C. Then the cokernel of $\varphi = (\varphi_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq 2}$ is an extension of $\mathcal{O}_Z$ by $\mathcal{O}_C$ without zero-dimensional torsion, hence, by Lemma 2.4, $\mathcal{F} \simeq \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi)$.

It remains to show that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}oker(\varphi)$ is semi-stable. Assume that the contrary holds and that there is a destabilizing subsheaf $\mathcal{E}$ which is itself semi-stable. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}) = 1$, we have $\chi(\mathcal{E}) = 1$. According to [1, Proposition 10], $P_{\mathcal{E}} \neq 2n+1$, $2m+1$, $3m+1$, $4m+1$. If $P_{\mathcal{E}} = rm + n + 1$, $r = 0, 1, 2, 3$, then resolution (13) fits into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-r) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-2,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-4) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

Since $\alpha \neq 0$, α is injective, hence β is injective, too, which is absurd. If $P_{\mathcal{E}} = m+1$, we obtain a similar diagram in which the first row is resolution (14) with $s = 0$. We obtain a contradiction in a similar manner. Assume that $P_{\mathcal{E}} = 4m + n + 1$. Then resolution (13) with $r = 4$ is part of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-4) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-2,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-4) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) \oplus \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

with α and β injective. But then β must factor through the kernel of the corestriction

$$\mathcal{O}(-2,-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}(-1,-4)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)$$

which is $\mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$. This is absurd. If $P_{\mathcal{E}}=m+2n+1$, then we obtain a similar diagram in which the first row is resolution (14) with $s=2$. We obtain a contradiction in a similar manner. Assume now that $P_{\mathcal{E}}=2m+2n+1$ and put $\mathcal{G}=\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}$. Then $P_{\mathcal{G}}=2m$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is semi-stable. Resolution (12) with $r=2$ is the second row of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-2,-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}(-1,-4) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \mathcal{O}(-1,-1)\oplus\mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0\\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & 2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & 2\mathcal{O}(-1,0) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

with $\alpha\neq 0$. Assume first that α_{11} and α_{21} are linearly independent. Then $\mathcal{C}oker(\alpha)\simeq\mathcal{O}(-1,1)$. However, there is no surjective morphism $2\mathcal{O}(-1,-1)\to\mathcal{O}(-1,1)$. We have reached a contradiction. Assume now that α_{11} and α_{21} are linearly dependent, say $\alpha_{21}=0$. Write

$$\psi=\begin{bmatrix}1\otimes u_{11} & 1\otimes u_{12}\\ 1\otimes u_{21} & 1\otimes u_{22}\end{bmatrix},\qquad \beta=\begin{bmatrix}v_1\otimes 1 & 1\otimes f_1\\ v_2\otimes 1 & 1\otimes f_2\end{bmatrix}.$$

From the relation

$$\psi\beta=\alpha\varphi=\begin{bmatrix}\alpha_{11}\varphi_{11} & \alpha_{11}\varphi_{12}\\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}$$

we get $v_1\otimes u_{21}+v_2\otimes u_{22}=0$ hence u_{21} and u_{22} are linearly dependent. Performing column operations on ψ and row operations on β we may write

$$\psi=\begin{bmatrix}1\otimes u_{11} & 1\otimes u_{12}\\ 0 & 1\otimes u_{22}\end{bmatrix},\qquad \beta=\begin{bmatrix}v_1\otimes 1 & 1\otimes f_1\\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $v_1\otimes u_{11}=\alpha_{11}\varphi_{11}\neq 0$ and $1\otimes u_{11}f_1=\alpha_{11}\varphi_{21}\neq 0$ we see that $v_1\neq 0$ and $f_1\neq 0$. Thus $\mathcal{K}er(\beta)\simeq\mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$ and $\mathcal{K}er(\alpha)\simeq\mathcal{O}$, hence we get the exact sequence

$$0\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}(-2,-4)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}\longrightarrow\mathcal{E},$$

and hence $\mathcal{E}$ has a subsheaf with Hilbert polynomial $4m+2n-2$. This is absurd. Assume, finally, that $P_{\mathcal{E}}=3m+2n+1$ and put $\mathcal{G}=\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{E}$. Then $P_{\mathcal{G}}=m$ and $\mathcal{G}$ is semi-stable. Resolution (12) with $r=1$ fits into the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-2,-1)\oplus\mathcal{O}(-1,-4) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \mathcal{O}(-1,-1)\oplus\mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{F} & \longrightarrow & 0\\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\beta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle\alpha} & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(-1,-1) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathcal{O}(-1,0) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{G} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

with $\alpha_{11}\neq 0$. Thus $\mathcal{K}er(\alpha)\simeq\mathcal{O}$. Since $\alpha_{11}\varphi_{11}=\psi\beta_{11}$, $\alpha_{11}\varphi_{12}=\psi\beta_{12}$ we see that $\beta_{11}\neq 0$, $\beta_{12}\neq 0$, hence $\mathcal{K}er(\beta)\simeq\mathcal{O}(-2,-4)$. As above, we obtain a subsheaf of $\mathcal{E}$ with Hilbert polynomial $4m+2n-2$. This is absurd. □

3. Variation of $\mathrm{M}^\alpha(4m+2n+1)$

A *pair* $(\Gamma, \mathcal{F})$ consists of a coherent algebraic sheaf $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and a vector subspace $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F})$ of dimension 1. The notion of pair is a particular case of the notion of *coherent system* in which we allow $\dim \Gamma$ to be arbitrary. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and let $P(m,n)$ be a linear polynomial with integer coefficients. Let $\mathrm{M}^\alpha(P)$ be the coarse moduli space of pairs $(\Gamma, \mathcal{F})$ that are α-semi-stable with respect to $\mathcal{O}(1,1)$ and such that $P_{\mathcal{F}} = P$. This moduli space was constructed in [7]. It is known that there are finitely many values $\alpha_1 < \ldots < \alpha_k$ in $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, called *walls*, such that $\mathrm{M}^\alpha(P) \simeq \mathrm{M}^{\alpha'}(P)$ for $\alpha, \alpha' \in (0, \alpha_1)$, or for $\alpha, \alpha' \in (\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$, or for $\alpha, \alpha' \in (\alpha_k, \infty)$.

Proposition 3.1. *With respect to $P(m,n) = 4m+2n+1$ there are only two walls at $\alpha_1 = 5$ and $\alpha_2 = 11$.*

Proof. As at [10, Proposition 5.2], we need to solve the equation

$$\frac{\alpha + t}{r+s} = \frac{\alpha+1}{6} \tag{17}$$

with $r \leq 4$, $s \leq 2$, $t \geq r+s-rs$, the case when $r=4$ and $s=2$ being excluded. Assume that $r=3$, $s=2$, $t \geq -1$. Equation (17) becomes $\alpha = 5-6t$, which has solutions $\alpha_1 = 5$ for $t=0$ and $\alpha_2 = 11$ for $t=-1$. Assume that $r=2$, $s=2$, $t \geq 0$. Equation (17) becomes $\alpha = 2-3t$, which has solution $\alpha = 2$ for $t=0$. In this case the strictly α-semi-stable locus in $\mathrm{M}^2(4m+2n+1)$ would consist of points of the form $(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}) \oplus (0, \mathcal{G})$, where $(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}) \in \mathrm{M}^{0+}(2m+2n)$ and $\mathcal{G} \in \mathrm{M}(2m+1)$. However, according to [1, Proposition 10], $\mathrm{M}(2m+1) = \emptyset$. Thus, there is no wall at $\alpha = 2$.

For all other choices of r and s we have $t \geq 1$, hence equation (17) has no positive solution. □

Denote $\mathbf{M}^\alpha = \mathrm{M}^\alpha(4m+2n+1)$. For $\alpha \in (11, \infty)$ we write $\mathbf{M}^\alpha = \mathbf{M}^\infty$. For $\alpha \in (5, 11)$ we write $\mathbf{M}^\alpha = \mathbf{M}^{5+} = \mathbf{M}^{11-}$. For $\alpha \in (0, 5)$ we write $\mathbf{M}^\alpha = \mathbf{M}^{0+}$. The inclusions of sets of α-semi-stable pairs induce the flipping diagrams



in which all maps are birational.

Remark 3.2. From Proposition 3.1 we see that the strictly α-semi-stable points in $\mathbf{M}^{11}$ are of the form $(\Gamma_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \oplus (0, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0))$, where $(\Gamma_1, \mathcal{E}_1) \in \mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1)$ and $L \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a line of bidegree $(0,1)$. According to [10, Theorem 2.2], $\mathcal{E}_1 \simeq \mathcal{O}_Q$ for a quintic curve $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of bidegree $(2,3)$. Thus, $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \simeq \mathbb{P}^{11}$. Again from Proposition 3.1 we see that the strictly α-semi-stable points in $\mathbf{M}^5$ are of the form $(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}) \oplus (0, \mathcal{O}_L)$, where $(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}) \in \mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n)$.

Proposition 3.3. *The points in $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n)$ are of the form $(\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}), \mathcal{E})$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is an extension of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a quintic curve of bidegree $(2,3)$ and p is a point on C. Thus $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n)$ is isomorphic to the universal quintic of bidegree $(2,3)$, so it is a

$\mathbb{P}^{10}$*-bundle over* $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$*. Moreover, the sheaves* $\mathcal{E}$ *are precisely the sheaves having resolutions of the form*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{18}$$

where $\varphi_{11} \neq 0$*,* $\varphi_{12} \neq 0$*.*

Proof. Assume that $(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$ gives a point in $\mathrm{M}^{\alpha}(3m+2n)$, with $\alpha < 5/4$. If $\mathcal{E}$ had a destabilizing subsheaf $\mathcal{E}'$, then $\chi(\mathcal{E}') \geq 1$ and the coherent subsystem $(0, \mathcal{E}')$ would have slope at least

$$\frac{\chi(\mathcal{E}')}{4} \geq \frac{1}{4} > \frac{\alpha}{5} = \mathrm{p}_{\alpha}(\Gamma, \mathcal{E}).$$

This would violate the α-semi-stability of $(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$. Thus $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{M}(3m+2n)$. Since $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}) \neq 0$, we can deduce, as in the proof of [10, Proposition 3.3], that there is an injective morphism $\mathcal{O}_C \to \mathcal{E}$ for a curve $C \subset \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ defined by an equation. As $\mathrm{p}(\mathcal{O}_C) \leq \mathrm{p}(\mathcal{E})$, we see that C has bidegree $(2,2)$ or $(2,3)$. The first case is unfeasible because for a curve of bidegree $(2,2)$ the subpair $(\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_C), \mathcal{O}_C)$ has slope $\alpha/4 > \mathrm{p}_{\alpha}(\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$. We obtain an extension as in the proposition.

Conversely, assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is an extension of $\mathbb{C}_p$ by $\mathcal{O}_Q$. Then it is easy to see that $\mathcal{E}$ is semi-stable. If $\mathcal{E}$ is stable, then $(\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}), \mathcal{E})$ gives a point in $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n)$. By continuity, the same is true if $\mathcal{E}$ is semi-stable but not stable.

Given an extension as in the proposition, we combine the standard resolution of $\mathcal{O}_Q$ with the resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}_p \longrightarrow 0$$

to obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \to \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-2,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1,-3) \to \mathcal{O}(-1,-2) \oplus \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{E} \to 0.$$

As in the proof of [9, Proposition 2.3.2], the map $\mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \to \mathcal{O}(-2,-3)$ is non-zero, so we obtain resolution (18). □

Consider the flipping loci

$$\begin{aligned} F^{\infty} &= \rho_{\infty}^{-1}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \times \mathrm{M}(m+2)) \subset \mathbf{M}^{\infty}, \\ F^{11} &= \rho_{11}^{-1}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \times \mathrm{M}(m+2)) \subset \mathbf{M}^{11-}, \\ F^{5} &= \rho_{5}^{-1}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n) \times \mathrm{M}(m+1)) \subset \mathbf{M}^{5+}, \\ F^{0} &= \rho_{0}^{-1}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n) \times \mathrm{M}(m+1)) \subset \mathbf{M}^{0+}. \end{aligned}$$

Over a point $(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \in \mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \times \mathrm{M}(m+2)$, F^{∞} has fiber $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2))$ and F^{11} has fiber $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_1))$. Over a point $(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4) \in \mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n) \times \mathrm{M}(m+1)$, F^5 has fiber $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4))$ and F^0 has fiber $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_3))$. The extension spaces of pairs can be computed using [7, Corollaire 1.6], which we quote below.

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $\Lambda = (\Gamma, \mathcal{F})$ *and* $\Lambda' = (\Gamma', \mathcal{F}')$ *be two coherent systems on a separated scheme of finite type over* $\mathbb{C}$*. Then there is a long exact sequence*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, \Lambda') &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{F}')/\Gamma') \\ &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda, \Lambda') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{F}')) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda, \Lambda') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^2(\mathcal{F}')). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.5. *The flipping loci* F^{∞}*,* F^{11}*,* F^5*,* F^0 *are smooth bundles with fibers* $\mathbb{P}^3$*,* $\mathbb{P}^1$*,* $\mathbb{P}^2$*, respectively,* $\mathbb{P}^1$*.*

Proof. Choose $\Lambda_1 = (\Gamma_1, \mathcal{O}_Q)$ and $\Lambda_2 = (0, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0))$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0))) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0))) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since Λ_1 and Λ_2 are stable coherent systems of different slopes, $\mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = 0$. From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(-2,-3) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_Q \longrightarrow 0 \tag{19}$$

we get the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(3,3)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^4 \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two long exact sequences we obtain $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \simeq \mathbb{C}^4$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Q)/\Gamma_1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_1) \longrightarrow \\ \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2))^* \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From (19) we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,1)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \longrightarrow \\ \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two exact sequences we obtain $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_1) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$.

Choose $\Lambda_3 = (\Gamma, \mathcal{E})$ and $\Lambda_4 = (0, \mathcal{O}_L)$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L)) \simeq \mathbb{C} \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From (18) we obtain the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L) \simeq \mathbb{C}^3 \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(2,2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(1,3)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^5 \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two exact sequences we get $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4) \simeq \mathbb{C}^3$. From Proposition 3.4 we obtain the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E})/\Gamma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_3) \longrightarrow \\ \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{E}) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2))^* \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E})) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From (18) we obtain the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-1,1)) \simeq \mathbb{C} \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2)) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2)) \simeq \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(-1,1)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two exact sequences we get $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_3) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$. □

Lemma 3.6. (i) *For $\Lambda \in F^{11}$ we have* $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda, \Lambda) = 0$.
(ii) *For $\Lambda \in F^0$ we have* $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda, \Lambda) = 0$.

Proof. (i) In view of the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Lambda_1 \longrightarrow \Lambda \longrightarrow \Lambda_2 \longrightarrow 0$$

it is enough to show that $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_i, \Lambda_j) = 0$ for $i, j = 1, 2$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0))) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q(-2,-2))^*. \end{aligned}$$

The group on the right vanishes because $\mathcal{O}_L$ is stable, by [10, Proposition 3.2], $\mathcal{O}_Q$ is stable, and $\mathcal{O}_L(1,0)$ has slope greater than the slope of $\mathcal{O}_Q(-2,-2)$. Thus, $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = 0$. From the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q)) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_1) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2))^* = 0 \end{aligned}$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_1)$. From the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0))) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_2) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0), \mathcal{O}_L(1,0)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L(1,0), \mathcal{O}_L(-1,-2)) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_2, \Lambda_2)$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Q)/\Gamma_1) & \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_Q) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_Q) &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_Q(-2,-2))^* = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The space $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1)$ is isomorphic to the tangent space of $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m + 2n - 1) \simeq \mathbb{P}^{11}$ at Λ_1, so it is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^{11}$. From (19) we get the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_Q) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Q) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Q(2,3)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^{11} \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_Q) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 &\longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q(2,3)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two exact sequences we obtain the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1)$.

(ii) From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L)) \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4) \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{E}(-2,-2))^* = 0.$$

Thus, $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_4) = 0$. From the exact sequence

$$0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E})) \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_3) \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{E}) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2))^* = 0$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_3)$. From the exact sequence

$$0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L)) \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_4) \to \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_L) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_L(-2,-2))^* = 0$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_4, \Lambda_4)$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E})/\Gamma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_3) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E})) \simeq \mathbb{C} \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_3, \Lambda_3) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}) &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}(-2,-2))^* = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From (18) we get the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}) \simeq \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}(1,2)) \oplus \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}(2,2)) \oplus \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{E}(1,3))$$
$$\longrightarrow \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E}(1,2)) \oplus \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E}(2,2)) \oplus \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{E}(1,3)) \longrightarrow 0.$$

It follows that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \operatorname{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}) = 1 - \chi(\mathcal{E}(1,2)) - \chi(\mathcal{E}) + \chi(\mathcal{E}(2,2)) + \chi(\mathcal{E}(1,3)) = 13.$$

The space $\operatorname{Ext}^1(\Lambda_3,\Lambda_3)$ is isomorphic to the tangent space at Λ_3 of $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n)$, which, according to Proposition 3.3, is smooth of dimension 12, so it is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^{12}$. We obtain the vanishing of $\operatorname{Ext}^2(\Lambda_3,\Lambda_3)$. □

The following proposition is a particular case of [11, Proposition B.8].

Proposition 3.7. *The variety $\mathbf{M}^{\infty}$ is isomorphic to the relative Hilbert scheme of three points contained in curves of bidegree $(2,4)$ in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, so it is a $\mathbb{P}^{11}$-bundle over $\operatorname{Hilb}_{\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1}(3)$.*

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\mathbf{M}^{\alpha}$ be the moduli space of α-semi-stable pairs on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ with Hilbert polynomial $P(m,n) = 4m + 2n + 1$. We have the following blowing up diagrams*



Here β_{∞} is the blow-up along F^{∞} and β_{11} is the contraction of the exceptional divisor $\widetilde{F}^{\infty}$ in the direction of $\mathbb{P}^3$, where we view $\widetilde{F}^{\infty}$ as a $\mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^1$-bundle with base $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \times \mathrm{M}(m+2)$. Likewise, β_5 is the blow-up along F^5 and β_0 is the contraction of the exceptional transform $\widetilde{F}^5$ in the direction of $\mathbb{P}^2$, where we view $\widetilde{F}^5$ as a $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n) \times \mathrm{M}(m+1)$.

Proof. A birational map $\beta_{11}\colon \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}^{\infty} \to \mathbf{M}^{11-}$ can be constructed as at [3, Theorem 3.3] such that β_{11} contracts $\widetilde{F}^{\infty}$ in the direction of $\mathbb{P}^3$, β_{11} is an isomorphism outside F^{11}, and $\beta_{11}^{-1}(x) \simeq \mathbb{P}^3$ for any $x \in F^{11}$. We then apply the Universal Property of the blow-up [6, p. 604] as in the proof of [10, Theorem 5.7]. Indeed, by Proposition 3.5, F^{11} is smooth, and, by Lemma 3.6(i), $\mathbf{M}^{11-}$ is smooth along F^{11}, so it is smooth at every point.

For the second blow-up diagram we reason analogously and we use the fact that F^0 is smooth and Lemma 3.6(ii). □

4. Variation of $\mathrm{M}^{\alpha}(4m+2n-1)$

The following proposition is analogous to [3, Lemma 5.1], which is stated for moduli of sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^2$ but is valid also in our context.

Proposition 4.1. *We have the equation of Poincaré polynomials*

$$\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{M}(4m+2n+1)) = \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(4m+2n+1)) - \xi\,\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(4m+2n-1)).$$

The Poincaré polynomial of $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(4m+2n+1))$ can be computed using the wall-crossing Theorem 3.8 and Proposition 3.7. It remains to find a wall-crossing theorem for $\mathrm{M}^{\alpha}(4m+2n-1)$. By analogy with Proposition 3.1 we find that relative to the polynomial $P(m,n)=4m+2n-1$ there is only one wall at $\alpha_1=1$. The strictly α-semi-stable points in $\mathrm{M}^1(4m+2n-1)$ are of the form $\Lambda_1\oplus\Lambda_5$, where $\Lambda_1\in\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1)$ and $\Lambda_5\in\mathrm{M}(m)$. Thus, $\Lambda_5=(0,\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))$ for a line $L\subset\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$ of bidegree $(0,1)$ We saw in the previous section that $\Lambda_1=(\Gamma_1,\mathcal{O}_Q)$ for a quintic curve $Q\subset\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$ of bidegree $(2,3)$, where $\Gamma_1=\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Q)$.

Proposition 4.2. *The variety $\mathrm{M}^{\infty}(4m+2n-1)$ is isomorphic to the universal curve of bidegree $(2,4)$ in $\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$, so it is a $\mathbb{P}^{13}$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$.*

Theorem 4.3. *The space $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(4m+2n-1)$ is smooth. We have the following blowing up diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \widetilde{\mathrm{M}}(4m+2n-1) & & \\ & \swarrow^{\beta_\infty} & & \searrow^{\beta_0} & \\ \mathrm{M}^{\infty}(4m+2n-1) & & & & \mathrm{M}^{0+}(4m+2n-1) \\ & \searrow_{\rho_\infty} & & \swarrow_{\rho_0} & \\ & & \mathrm{M}^1(4m+2n-1) & & \end{array}$$

in which ρ_∞ and ρ_0 are the maps induced by the inclusions of sets of α-semi-stable pairs, β_∞ is the blow-up with center the flipping locus

$$F^{\infty}(4m+2n-1)=\rho_{\infty}^{-1}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1)\times\mathrm{M}(m)),$$

which is smooth of codimension 2, and β_0 is the blow-up with center the flipping locus

$$F^{0}(4m+2n-1)=\rho_{0}^{-1}(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1)\times\mathrm{M}(m)),$$

which is smooth of codimension 2.

The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 3.8 and is based on the following proposition and lemma.

Proposition 4.4. *The flipping loci $F^{\infty}(4m+2n-1)$ and $F^{0}(4m+2n-1)$ are smooth bundles with fiber $\mathbb{P}^1$ and base $\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1)\times\mathrm{M}(m)\simeq\mathbb{P}^{11}\times\mathbb{P}^1$.*

Proof. Note that $F^{\infty}(4m+2n-1)$ has fiber $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_5))$ over (Λ_1,Λ_5), while $F^0(4m+2n-1)$ has fiber $\mathbb{P}(\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_5,\Lambda_1))$. From Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0&=\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1,\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)))\\ &\longrightarrow\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1,\Lambda_5)\longrightarrow\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q,\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))\longrightarrow\mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1,\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)))=0.\end{aligned}$$

From (19) we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0=\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))\longrightarrow\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(1,3))\simeq\mathbb{C}^2&\\ \longrightarrow\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q,\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))\longrightarrow\mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))=0.&\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_5) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$. Again from Proposition 3.4 we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_Q)/\Gamma_1) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_5, \Lambda_1) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-3,-2))^* &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

From (19) we have the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,1)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-3,-2)) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-3,-2)) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,1)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\Lambda_5, \Lambda_1) \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$. □

Lemma 4.5. *For $\Lambda \in F^0(4m+2n-1)$ we have $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda, \Lambda) = 0$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_i, \Lambda_j) = 0$ for $i, j = 1, 5$. From the proof of Lemma 3.6(i) we already know that $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1) = 0$. From the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(\Gamma_1, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_5) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q(-2,-2))^* &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_5)$. From the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_Q)) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_5, \Lambda_1) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0), \mathcal{O}_Q) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_Q, \mathcal{O}_L(-3,-2))^* &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_5, \Lambda_1)$. From the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathrm{Hom}(0, \mathrm{H}^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0))) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_5, \Lambda_5) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0), \mathcal{O}_L(-1,0)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L(-1,0), \mathcal{O}_L(-3,-2))^* &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

we get the vanishing of $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\Lambda_5, \Lambda_5)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By Theorem 3.8 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}(\mathbf{M}^{0+}) = \mathrm{P}(\mathbf{M}^{\infty}) &+ \big(\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1) - \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^3)\big)\,\mathrm{P}\big(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \times \mathrm{M}(m+2)\big) \\ &+ \big(\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1) - \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^2)\big)\,\mathrm{P}\big(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n) \times \mathrm{M}(m+1)\big). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.7, Remark 3.2 and Proposition 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}(\mathbf{M}^{0+}) = \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^{11})\,\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{Hilb}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(3)) &+ (\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1) - \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^3))\,\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^{11})\,\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1) \\ &+ (\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1) - \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^2))\,\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^{10})\,\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1)\,\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1). \end{aligned}$$

According to [5, Theorem 0.1],

$$\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{Hilb}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(3)) = \xi^6 + 3\xi^5 + 9\xi^4 + 14\xi^3 + 9\xi^2 + 3\xi + 1.$$

By Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}\big(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(4m+2n-1)\big) = \mathrm{P}\big(\mathrm{M}^{\infty}(4m+2n-1)\big) &+ \\ \big(\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1) - \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1)\big)\,\mathrm{P}\big(\mathrm{M}^{0+}(3m+2n-1) \times \mathrm{M}(m)\big) & \\ = \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{M}^{\infty}(4m+2n-1)) = \mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^{13})\,\mathrm{P}(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1). & \end{aligned}$$

The final result follows from Proposition 4.1:

$$\mathrm{P}(\mathbf{M}) = \frac{\xi^{12}-1}{\xi-1}(\xi^6+3\xi^5+9\xi^4+14\xi^3+9\xi^2+3\xi+1) - (\xi^3+\xi^2)\frac{\xi^{12}-1}{\xi-1}(\xi+1) \\ - \xi^2\frac{\xi^{11}-1}{\xi-1}(\xi+1)^3 - \xi\frac{\xi^{14}-1}{\xi-1}(\xi+1)^2.$$

References

[1] E. Ballico, S. Huh. *Stable sheaves on a smooth quadric surface with linear Hilbert bipolynomials.* Sci. World J. (2014), article ID 346126.

[2] N. P. Buchdahl. *Stable 2-bundles on Hirzebruch surfaces.* Math. Z. **194** (1987), 143–152.

[3] J. Choi, K. Chung. *Moduli spaces of α-stable pairs and wall-crossing on $\mathbb{P}^2$.* J. Math. Soc. Japan **68** (2016), 685–709.

[4] J. Choi, S. Katz, A. Klemm. *The refined BPS index from stable pair invariants.* Commun. Math. Phys. **328** (2014), 903–954.

[5] L. Göttsche. *The Betti numbers of the Hilbert scheme of points on a smooth projective surface.* Math. Ann. **286** (1990), 193–207.

[6] P. Griffiths, J. Harris. *Principles of algebraic geometry.* John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1994.

[7] M. He. *Espaces de modules de systèmes cohérents.* Int. J. Math. **9** (1998), 545–598.

[8] J. Le Potier. *Faisceaux semi-stables de dimension* 1 *sur le plan projectif.* Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **38** (1993), 635–678.

[9] M. Maican. *On the moduli spaces of semi-stable plane sheaves of dimension one and multiplicity five.* Ill. J. Math. **55** (2011), 1467–1532.

[10] M. Maican. *Moduli of sheaves supported on curves of genus two contained in a smooth quadric surface.* arXiv:1612.03566

[11] R. Pandharipande, R. P. Thomas. *Stable pairs and BPS invariants.* J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), 267–297.

Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, Calea Grivitei 21, Bucharest 010702, Romania

E-mail address: maican@imar.ro